REMARKS

In the Advisory Action dated November 30, 2005, the Examiner continues to insist that D'Arlach discloses *"at least one component that reacts interactively on user input by executing instructions contained in said component on the server"* as recited in claim 6. Applicant strongly disagrees, and notes that claim 6 additionally requires *"at least one page template having at least one selected component incorporated therein."* Applicant proposes to amend claim 6 to insert the term *"selected"* as shown above to provide additional clarity regarding the nature of the claimed components, and to reinforce this distinction over D'Arlach. This amendment does not require additional searching or any significant work on the part of the PTO, and it will simplify the discussion of issues by putting the claim in better form for appeal.

D'Arlach uses elements and objects on his page templates while applicant uses components on his templates. Nevertheless, the elements and objects described in D'Arlach are merely static database items, they do not contain instructions, and they are not interactive. However, applicant further limits the term "components" within claim 6 by defining another special type of component, i.e. a *"selected component"* that reacts interactively on user input by executing instructions on the server. The elements and objects disclosed in D'Arlach do not have this capability, and there is no teaching or suggestion that they could or that it would be desirable.

The Examiner the goes on to state that "[e]xecuting as claimed [by] applicant is equivalent to modifying a template and displaying it on a browser." However, this is a function carried out by the D'Arlach's editor, not by the elements and objects. Interpretating the claim in this way fails to take into account the context of the entire claim language. According to applicant's claim 6, there has to be at least one of these "selected components" incorporated into a page template. D'Arlach does have an editor that reacts interactively, but the editor is not contained on a page template. Therefore, the examiner has failed to show such a "selected component." Thus, applicant's claim 6 is believed to be distinct and patentable over D'Arlach.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states in the advisory action that claim 1 would be distinct "if Applicant claimed dynamically editing a web page while the webpage is being run on the browser." Applicant believes that claim 1 already contains such a limitation. Claim 1 requires *"a page generator running one of the applications being developed by generating generated documents"* (emphasis added). This can happen during editing because claim 1

JMBM Ref. 66363-5001

requires that the generated documents contain editing features, and because the editor is operating via the editing features. Thus, applicant believes that claim 1 adequately recites the distinction proposed by the Examiner.

Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffer, Mangels, Butler & Marmaro LLP

Date: ___1/6/2006___   By: _____

Richard A. Nebb
Reg. No. 33,540

1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4308
(415) 398-8080 tel
(310) 398-5584 fax
rnebb@jmbm.com

U.S. App. No. 09/449,021   - 4 -

PAGE 5/5 * RCVD AT 1/6/2006 2:29:24 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/32 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:415 398 5584 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-16